DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 834 TM 034 859

AUTHOR	Johnson, E. Jean; Morgan, Ronald R.
TITLE	Variability in Teaching Educational Psychology: Comparisons across Variables.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Course Content; Curriculum; *Educational Psychology; Institutional Characteristics; *Preservice Teachers; Student Characteristics; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The teaching of educational psychology in teacher preparation programs was studied, focusing on some of the dimensions noted by Rocklin (1996): student characteristics, instructor characteristics, and institutional/course characteristics. A student assessment was used to determine student demographics, educational types, knowledge about educational psychology, ability to sequence instruction, and preferences for diverse modes of instruction. A content analysis of course materials and interviews with students and instructors also provided data. Four institutions, 20 instructors, and 721 students participated. Results yield limited information related to the purpose and place of educational psychology within teacher education programs of study. Some preliminary empirically based recommendations can be made. It appears, because of the relationships found in the multiple analyses and diverse reviews of the data set, educational psychology is best taught by an instructor with some advanced training in the discipline. Students should take educational psychology later, rather than sooner, in their training. It also appears that the educational psychology requirement within a teacher education program seems to yield better outcomes for students if taught as a two-semester sequence. The interview questions are attached. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 834

Running Head: VARIABILITY IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Variability in Teaching Educational Psychology: Comparisons Across Variables

E. Jean Johnson

Governors State University

Ronald R. Morgan

Loyola University Chicago

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. J. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

84th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

Chicago, IL

April, 2003

TM034859

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Variability in Teaching Educational Psychology: Comparisons Across Variables

The role of educational psychology in teacher preparation programs has recently been called into question (Anderson, Blumenfeld, Pintrich, Clark, Marx, & Peterson, 1995; Shuell, 1996). In 1995, the Educational Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association's Ad Hoc Committee on the Teaching of Educational Psychology called for research and development about teaching educational psychology (Anderson et al.). Although the Ad Hoc Committee and others (Anderson et al., 1995; Shuell, 1996) have described a variety of contexts in which educational psychology is taught, there is no body of research designed to investigate the outcomes of such variety (Renninger, 1996).

In response to this call, a research team was formed between two universities in the Chicago area. This team includes full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate student instructors assigned to teach multiple sections of undergraduate and graduate level educational psychology courses. Multiple individual studies are contributing in various ways to this ongoing teaching educational psychology research project. The goals of this project are to improve pedagogy in educational psychology and examine the role of educational psychology in teacher education.

Purpose

The overall purpose of this part of that larger study was to investigate the teaching of educational psychology in teacher preparation programs along some of the dimensions noted by Rocklin (1996). These dimensions include student characteristics, instructor characteristics, and institutional/course characteristics. For the present study, the variables targeted for investigation included: student characteristics [age, gender, ethnicity, student status (day/eve student, undergraduate/graduate student, and full/part time), major, and prior educational psychology

knowledge]; instructor characteristics (experience teaching at college level, experience teaching at K-12 level, educational level); and institution/course characteristics (placement of educational psychology in the program, one- or two-semester sequence, use of case studies, class size, clinical/field experience, number of reflective activities required, and types of instructional practices/methods used). Outcome measures against which these dimensions were compared included student educational psychology knowledge, student ability to appropriately sequence an instructional event, and student tendency to use diverse assessments.

Research Questions

Derived from the dimensions noted by Rocklin (1996), characteristics of students, instructors, and institutions/courses were compared in relationship to a number of outcome measures. The following specific research questions were addressed:

I. Are there significant differences in the outcome measures across student characteristic categories?

II. Are there significant differences in the outcome measures across instructor characteristic categories?

III. Are there significant differences in the outcome measures across institution/course characteristic categories?

IV. Are there significant prediction relationships among student, instructor, institution/course characteristic categories and the outcome measures?

Methods and Data Analyses

A student assessment instrument was used to ascertain student's demographics, educational types, knowledge about educational psychology, ability to sequence instruction, and preferences for diverse modes of assessment. A copy of this instrument is provided at the end of this paper. In addition to the student assessment instruments (pre-post), a content analysis of course

materials and a series of interviews of students and instructors were used. Copies of the interview questions are also provided.

All of the variables were directly determined from the assessment instruments and/or course materials provided by the instructors with the exception being the main instructional method/practice used by the instructor. This variable was created from multiple sources of data and documented by a rater. A series of analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were used to test for differences related to the first three research questions. Regression analysis procedures were used to test for any relationships among the variables targeted for study and noted in the last question.

Participants and Variable Characteristics

Four institutions, 20 instructors, and 721 students participated in this pre-post cross-sectional study. There were 36 sections (nine different courses) of educational psychology included in this study. Each section had between 7-33 students enrolled. There were 21 sections of undergraduate only courses and six graduate-only courses. Twenty-one of the courses were taught at a relatively small upper-division suburban public university, eight at a large urban public university, five at a medium sized urban private university, and two at a medium sized urban public university. Seventeen of the courses at the upper-division university were part of a two-course educational psychology sequence. Of these 17, eight were first semester courses and the remaining nine were second semester courses in a two-course sequence. All other courses were considered one-semester only courses. Five sections were "pre-assessment only" courses, eight sections were "post-assessment only" courses, and the remaining 23 were administered both the pre- and post-assessment instruments.

The student sample was predominately white (85%) and female (82%). The students were overwhelmingly full-time (73%) undergraduate (78.5%) elementary education majors (72%) and attended courses primarily in the daytime (70%). The ages of the students ranged from 18-53 with an average age of 27 years. Of the 721 students, the majority (62%) attended the upper-division institution.

There were three characteristics of faculty that were targeted for study. Instructor characteristics were obtained for 13 of the 20 instructors. The instructors had taught at the college level within a range between 0-30 years with an average of 6.7 years of college teaching experience. They ranged in K-12 experience from 0-32 years with an average of nine years. Of the six possible categories originally targeted for study related to this variable (baccalaureate, masters, masters+, ABD, doctorate, and doctorate+), three were found to be present in the sample. Six of the instructors had completed doctorates or higher. Four of the instructors were ABD (all but dissertation). The remaining three had master's degrees plus advanced (usually some doctoral level coursework) training above the master's degree.

There were seven characteristics of interest related to the courses selected for study. Where the educational psychology course was placed in the teacher education program of study was the first characteristic. Placement of the course within the program had three possible levels: early; middle; or late. The majority of programs placed the course at the middle or later part of the program of study, with a very small percentage occurring early on.

The second course characteristic selected for study was the type of course offered. There were five levels originally determined for this variable: one course (undergraduate only), one course (mixed undergraduate and graduate), first course of a two course sequence, second course

of a two course sequence, and one course (graduate only). None of the courses surveyed fell under the one course (mixed) category. A review of participants in those categories revealed that students in the one-semester courses were more alike than students in the sequenced courses. As the intent of this variable was to investigate possible differences on the basis of whether the course is a one-semester course or part of a sequence (and not whether the course is undergraduate or graduate), the four categories were recoded into three categories: one-semester course types, first of a two-semester sequence, and second of a two-semester sequence. This three level variable was used in all subsequent analyses.

The third course characteristic selected for study was related to the amount of case study use in the course. As a result of the analysis of course materials, this variable was scaled from "no case study use" to "heavy case study use." There were four possible categories with the heavy case study use category having the highest frequency (39%). Class size was the fourth course characteristic selected for study. Class size ranged from 7-88 with an average class size of 25 (s = 9.55). The amount of field and/or clinical experience required in the course was the fifth course characteristic. For this variable, an eight-point ordinal scale was created, ranging from no field experiences required to 11+ and lab based courses. Only five categories were found to contain frequencies. There were no lab-based courses, courses requiring 6-10 hours of observation only, or courses requiring 11+ of observation only. The majority of the courses (5 of 9) did not have a clinical requirement.

The last two characteristics of interest for courses were the amount of reflective activity the students were expected to complete in the course and the main instructional method used by the instructor. The method of instruction variable was a score created by a detailed content analysis

and ratings of the course and interview materials. For the 12 instructors rated, the scores ranged from 1.5-3.75 (on a 5-point scale) with an average score of 3.15 (s = .59). The amount of reflective activity included in a course was determined by the content analysis of the course materials. For this variable, a four-point ordinal scale was created. The scale ranged from "no reflective activities" being required to a "large amount" required. All four levels were found to be present in the courses surveyed. The majority of courses had a "light" amount (44%) of reflection required.

Findings

Question One

Question one focused upon differences in outcome measures across student characteristic categories. Each was compared with each of the three outcome measures: educational psychology knowledge, sequencing instruction, and tendency to use diverse assessments. There were significant differences in educational psychology knowledge for some of these characteristics. Significant differences in educational psychology knowledge were found for age, gender, and major. For age [F (35, 351) = 1.564, p = .025], follow-up correlation analyses indicated that age was significantly and positively related to performance on these assessments ($p < .05$). However, age was also found to be significantly related to course placement, *rho* (635) = .466, p = .0001, and whether the student had a previous degree, *rho* (590) = .470, p = .0001. Older students were more likely to have had more educational psychology courses due to previous degrees and took the educational psychology course later in their program of studies.

There were significant differences found in educational psychology knowledge across genders, F (1, 400) = 10.652, p = .001. Scores were found to be significantly higher for females.

Due to small cell sizes for two of the majors (early childhood and special education), the more conservative Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA procedures were used to test for differences on the basis of major. Significant differences in educational psychology knowledge were found, $\chi^2(4) = 10.88$, $p = .028$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Mann-Whitney U statistic were conducted and revealed that there were significant differences between elementary and secondary majors (with elementary majors scoring higher) and secondary and the "other major" category (with secondary scoring higher).

Question Two

Question two focused upon differences in outcomes across instructor characteristic categories. The instructor categories were experience teaching at the college level, the K-12 level, and instructor degree. Due to significant Levene statistics and some small cell sizes, Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs were used in calculations for the two instructor experience measures. Since the variables were considered to be ordinal, the follow-up comparisons utilized correlation coefficients (Spearman).

The first instructor variable had to do with experience at the college level. Significant differences were found in educational psychology knowledge for this variable, $\chi^2(6) = 12.680$, $p = .048$. For knowledge and instructor college experience, the relationship was inverse and associated with the instructor's degree. The more experienced professors had students with less knowledge at the end of the course. However, the professors in this study with more college experience and advanced degrees were also usually teaching at the graduate level (more applied courses). The content of these courses was perhaps "beyond" the content sampled on the instrument. The students just completing this basic content, those with the less experienced

professors and more "basic" courses, did perform better on the posttest. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that students in the more applied courses did significantly better on the pretest.

Instructor degree was a variable that indicated the level of education of the instructor, not advanced training in educational psychology. A visual inspection of the instructor data revealed that only about one-half of the instructors held degrees (ABD or PhD) in educational psychology. The remainders of the instructors' degrees were in curriculum and instruction or a related area. If the means for the post test are recalculated along the lines of training in educational psychology, the students with instructors having advanced training in educational psychology averaged higher (mean = 63.1) than those who had an instructor without the training (mean = 58.6).

The second outcome for which significant differences were found was in the students' tendency to use diverse assessment, χ^2 (7) = 27.78, p = .0001. Again, the relationship was inverse (*rho* = -.085). Post hoc comparisons for these characteristics would support a conclusion that the differences were due to individual instructors.

For the instructor K-12 experience variable, significant differences were also found in knowledge, χ^2 (7) = 18.39, p = .01, and assessment, χ^2 (8) = 27.53, p = .001. Post hoc comparisons indicated that the relationship for knowledge was inverse (*rho* = -.086). For assessment use, it was positive (*rho* = .082). No significant differences were found in the ability to sequence instruction on the basis of K-12 experience.

For instructor's degree, significant differences were found in knowledge and assessment use. For knowledge, *F* (2, 373) = 9.196, p = .0001, the post-hoc comparisons indicated that the differences were between MA+/doctorates and ABD/doctorates. There was also a significant

correlation for this variable, *rho* (374) = -.213, p = .0001. A review of the data indicates that instructors with MA+ had higher student posttest scores. The means for MA+, ABD, and doctorates were 67.22, 62.34, and 56.10 respectively. For assessment use, *F* (2, 345) = 8.321, p = .0001, the post-hoc comparisons indicated that the differences were between MA+/ABD and MA+/doctorates. There was also a significant correlation found for this variable, *rho* (346) = -.214, p = .0001. It would appear that instructor's with more advanced degrees tended to have students who were less likely to use diverse assessment measures. When instructor degree was dissected for educational psychology training, as was done for the knowledge and degree comparison, the relationship did not change as it did for the former.

Question Three

The third question focused upon differences in outcomes across institution/course characteristic categories. The institution/course characteristic categories were the placement position of the educational psychology course(s) within the program, one- or two-semester sequence course, amount of case study use, class size, amount of field experience required, amount of reflective activities required, and the main instructional method/practice used.

Significant differences in two of the outcome measures were found. For educational psychology knowledge, there were significant differences found on the basis of course placement, course type, case use, class size, field experiences, and reflection activities. For course placement, *F* (2, 456) = 15.826, p = .0001, students taking educational psychology later in their program outperformed those taking it earlier.

Course type was also a characteristic for which there were significant differences in knowledge, *F* (3, 456) = 54.81, p = .0001. A significant correlation for this variable, *rho* (457) =

.418, p = .0001, was supported by post hoc Tukey calculations that revealed significant differences between all of the groups. The Tukey values are found in Table 2. This relationship held throughout the regression analyses. Course type was the one course characteristic that remained in the model for knowledge prediction. Students in the second of two courses outperformed those in the first of two and the one course only type.

Table 2

Tukey Statistics for Course Type and Posttest

Course Place	One Semester	First of Two	Second of Two
One Semester	--	10.21*	19.78*
First of Two		--	9.57*
Second of Two			--

*p < .05

There were significant differences found in knowledge on the basis of case use, F (3, 328) = 21.912, p = .0001. Post-hoc comparisons revealed that the differences were between heavy case use and the others. Students in courses with heavy case use tended to perform better than their counterparts in other courses. The heavier case use classes in this study were all later in the program and/or the second of a two-semester sequence.

Class size for this sample ranged from 7-88 with a mean of 24.8 (s = 9.6). There were 22 different class sizes within this range. The presence of numerous significant Levene statistics and some extremely small cell sizes made both the calculation of one-way ANOVAs and Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs inappropriate for making meaningful comparisons across the outcome measures. Therefore, class size was regrouped into a three level ordinal variable. Small class size ranged from 0-22 and accounted for approximately 36% of the sample (n = 258). Medium class size ranged from 23-26 and accounted for approximately 30% (n = 216). Large class size

ranged from 27-88 and accounted for the remaining 34% (n = 245). This recoded variable had adequate cell sizes and met the homogeneity of variance assumption.

For the recoded class size variable, there was a significant difference in knowledge, F (2, 294) = 4.118, p = .017. The post-hoc comparisons revealed that the differences lay between the small/medium and medium/large classes. The medium sized course was the level at which higher scores were found on knowledge. There was an apparent confound however. Approximately 73% of the medium sized course category was of the one- or two-semester course type. The other class size categories were fairly equal in terms of the distribution of course types. The large number of sequenced courses in this category appears to have played a factor here. When the sequenced courses were removed from the analysis, the significant difference in knowledge for class size vanished.

The final differences in knowledge on the basis of course characteristics were for field experiences and reflection activities. A significant difference in the knowledge scores on the basis of field experiences was found to be present, F (4, 326) = 3.75, p = .028. A post-hoc comparison revealed that the differences were to be found between two pairs: none/1-5 observation only and none/11+ observation and report. A visual inspection of the data revealed that the majority of courses that did not require clinical experiences were the graduate and second semester courses. The majority of these students would have already had an educational psychology course and would therefore be more likely to have a higher score. In addition, of 517 students, 308 (60%) did not have any required field experience associated with their course. The remaining 40% was distributed across the other levels. The uneven frequencies here might have been a factor. This supposition was supported when the level of "no field experience" was

eliminated. Then, the significant differences vanished. Therefore, field experiences do not appear to be related to educational psychology knowledge.

For reflective activities, the significant difference, F (3, 328) = 16.695, p = .0001, was for the level of "light" reflection. All of the second of two-semester courses were placed at this level. The fact that students in this course scored higher has already been discussed. If they are removed from consideration, the difference disappears. Reflection activities do not appear to be associated with educational psychology content knowledge.

The second outcome for which significant differences were found was the tendency to use diverse assessments. Significant differences were noted for course type, method, case use, and reflection. For course type, χ^2 (2) = 8.92, p = .012, the difference was also found to be linear, *rho* (421) = .145, p = .003. The Mann Whitney U comparisons indicated that the significant difference was between the one semester course type and the second-of-two course type. In each case, the two-semester students were more likely to use diverse/alternative assessments, the second-of-two type more so than the other two types.

There were differences in assessment use on the basis of method. Only 12 instructors provided enough information to be analyzed and rated for the method variable. Although their students could be coded for this variable (total n = 485), cell sizes were based upon a sample of 12 instructors without enough variation to partition. Therefore, ANOVA was not considered to be appropriate in this situation. Cautious use of correlations is appropriate for preliminary identification of possible trends that may be supported by ANOVA when the database reaches a larger size. Since the method variable was on the ordinal scale, Spearman correlation coefficients were used. The significant correlation between method and assessment use, *rho*

(286) = .154, p = .009, was positive. Faculty using more non-traditional methods had students who were more likely to use diverse/alternative assessments.

For the characteristic of case use, the significant differences in assessment use, F (3, 307) = 4.087, p = .007, were between none/light and none/heavy. Students in the courses with heavier case usage showed more of a tendency to use diverse assessments. Significant differences in assessment use were also found based upon the amount of reflection activities in the course, F (3, 307) = 4.52, p = .004. Post-hoc comparisons for this variable indicated that the significant differences were between none/light (Tukey = 3.76) and none/medium (Tukey = 3.03) reflective level groups. The means of assessment use for the categories of none, light, medium, and heavy were 3.67, 7.43, 6.70, and 6.09 respectively. Students in the courses with no reflective activities showed significantly less of a tendency to use diverse/alternative assessments. It may be the case that reflection is related to assessment use, but further analysis (including experimental manipulations) would be required to substantiate this claim.

Question Four

The final question called for an investigation of the possible inter-relationships among the variables targeted for study. In order to answer this question, a number of multiple regression analyses were conducted. Individual characteristic category regressions and across category regressions yielded some significant relationships in terms of predictors. For educational psychology knowledge, the individual characteristic regressions indicated that course type, age, gender, and the instructor's degree were the significant predictors within their respective categories. However, when all of the variables were loaded simultaneously (across category

regressions), only course type and the instructor's degree remained as significant predictors, R^2 = .143, AD R^2 = .136, F (2, 247) = 20.633, p = .0001.

There were no significant differences found in the outcome measure of sequencing instruction for any of the variables noted in the questions above. As expected, no significant regression equations were produced for this outcome measure.

The last outcome measure for which regressions were conducted was the student's tendency to use diverse assessments. The individual characteristic regressions indicated that the instructor's degree, method, and case study use were significant predictors within their categories. When all of the variables were loaded across categories, only the instructor's degree remained as a significant predictor, R^2 = .059, AD R^2 = .053, F (1, 173) = 10.778, p = .001.

Discussion

In a review of literature, these authors discerned concerns about the future of educational psychology in teacher education programs of study. However, the instructors in this study appeared to value educational psychology and reported that it should have a more prominent role within their respective programs. They seemed to value the "contemporary psychological perspective" and were making strides towards teaching in less traditional ways and incorporating clinical, reflective, and case-based experiences in order to

In the descriptions of the present sample, one conclusion is that there were some differences between the "picture" of the educational psychology student to be found in the literature and the typical student in this study. The percentages of minorities and persons already holding degrees in this cohort were both higher than expected. If these four universities are doing something different to recruit and support minority candidates in teacher education, it should be discerned

and disseminated to other post-secondary institutions. Although not a focus of this study, the issue regarding the inadequate presence of minority teachers is an active publication area, one of personal interest, and one for which exemplary practices need to be discerned in order to increase the number of minority candidates in the teaching pool. As we enter an era where massive teacher shortages are being predicted, the fact that these universities also appeared to be attracting persons with previous degrees and careers into their teacher training programs should also be systematically investigated.

The question related to whom is and perhaps should be teaching educational psychology cannot be answered definitively from the results of this study. Future investigations in this area need to place a priority on expanding the data set so that adequate comparisons would be possible and ascertain whether the differences found here would remain in a larger sample. At best, because there were differential relationships (some positive and some negative) for many instructor characteristics, it is recommended that educational psychology is probably best taught by someone with advanced training in the field who would either have (or be team teaching with someone who had) practical experience in teaching. Because there were some positive results associated with higher education experiences, the contention in the literature that new instructors in educational psychology be mentored is supported by the interpretation of the findings. Experienced instructors of educational psychology need to take a more active role in the training and mentoring of new instructors. This idea is also supported from our personal experience of participating on the Teaching Educational Psychology Research Team. Many of the team members have remarked as to how it has impacted their own teaching as a result of the discussions in team meetings regarding teaching and the results of the various research

initiatives. However, additional research is certainly essential to make more than a preliminary recommendation for practice.

In addition to the "when" and "who" questions, certainly an area in need of additional study is the "how." The fairly positive results for case use, clinical experiences, and reflection activities found in this study are tempered not just by deficiencies in the size of the sample, but by other considerations as well. The type of cases used by the instructors was not investigated, nor was how the cases were used within the context of the instructional process. The same holds true for the role of clinical experiences and reflective activities. In addition, the heavier case use classes in this study were all placed later in the program and/or were the second of a two-semester sequence. Additional investigation is needed that not only increases the sample size, but turns a more focused lens on these characteristics.

Finally, in addition to the above-mentioned recommendations, which outcome measures are used to determine effects should be given additional attention. While, the assessment of educational psychology knowledge appears to have fairly good face validity, a more rigorous analysis in support of validity and reliability would appear to be in order. The assessment measure was a self-report instrument. Perhaps, if future researchers extend their efforts to the evaluation of actual classroom practices, the subjects' actual use of assessments (instead of predictions about assessment) could be obtained and compared based upon some of the characteristics of interest documented in this study. The sequencing instruction measure was the one outcome for which there were no significant differences on the basis of the characteristics. The lack of any differences in this measure might call into question its validity. One might assume that students in a teacher education program of study had not yet spent enough time

sequencing instruction to be able to perform well on this exercise. However, there were graduate students in this sample, the majority of whom were practicing teachers. The fact that there were no differences on this measure between undergraduates and practicing teachers supports the supposition that this measure lacks something. Future investigators should definitely look into alternative ways to measure a subjects' ability to create and sequence instruction.

Summary Statement

What exactly is the purpose and/or place of educational psychology within teacher education programs of study? The results of this study have yielded limited information related to addressing this question. Nonetheless, in terms of investigating the teaching of educational psychology along some of the dimensions noted by Rocklin (1996), some preliminary empirically-based recommendations have been made. The three foremost recommendations stem from the results related to three of the characteristics of interest. Understanding that the recommendations are interpreted with caution due to the non-experimental nature of the design and small cell sizes for some of the variables targeted for study, it appears that, because of the relationships found in the multiple analyses and diverse (both quantitative and qualitative) reviews of the data set, that educational psychology is best taught by an instructor with some advanced training in the discipline. In addition, students should be taking educational psychology later rather than sooner in their respective programs of study. Finally, the educational psychology requirement within teacher education programs of study seems to yield better outcomes for students if taught as a two-semester sequence.

References

Anderson, L. M., Blumenfeld, P., Pintrich, P. R., Clark, C. M., Marx, R. W., & Peterson, P. (1995). Educational psychology for teachers: Reforming our courses, rethinking our roles. *Educational Psychologist, 30*(3), 143-157.

Renninger, K. A. (1996). Learning as the focus of the educational psychology course. *Educational Psychologist, 31*(1), 63-76.

Rocklin, T. (1996). Variations in excellence: Context matters in reforming our courses and rethinking our roles. *Educational Psychologist, 3* (1), 35-40.

Shuell, T. J. (1996). The role of educational psychology in the preparation of teachers. *Educational Psychologist, 31*(1), 5-14.

Governors State University/Northeastern Illinois University/
Loyola University Chicago/Western Michigan University

Research Project on the Teaching of Educational Psychology

Post-Assessment **Section Code:_____**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this collaborative research effort. Although we will ask you to fill in your name on this questionnaire, it will not become a part of the database or be published in any way. We are asking for your name simply to match your responses here with your grade for the course. Names will be destroyed after the data are collected and entered into the database. Database entries are anonymous. Your performance on this assessment does not affect your final grade for this course in any way.

Name:_____Today's Date:_____

I give permission for my final grade to be released for entry into the database: I know my name will not be used.

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

Demographic Questions:

Age in years:_____

Sex: (Circle one) Female Male

Ethnicity: (Circle Applicable)
White (Non-Hispanic)
Black (Non-Hispanic)
Hispanic
American Indian or Alaskan native
Asian or Pacific Islander
Other

Phone (If open to interview):___

_____

Education Status Questions:

Present Major:_____

Attendance: (Circle One) Full time Part time

Status: (Circle One)
Graduate
Undergraduate

Do you attend classes primarily:
Daytime
Evening

Previous Degree(s):_____

Educational Psychology Knowledge

Please answer these questions to the best of your ability. Guessing is allowed.

1. According to Piaget, people's need for order, structure, and predictability is called:
   a. development
   b. learning
   c. maturation
   d. equilibrium

2. Which of the following are essential to Vygotsky's view of development?
   a. Social interaction and activity
   b. Close emotional relationships with adults and peers
   c. Adaptation through experimentation
   d. Individual trial and error and experimentation

3. Using Gardner's theory of intelligence, in which of the following dimensions would sales people be most likely to score highly?
   a. Intrapersonal Intelligence
   b. Linguistic Intelligence
   c. Logical-Mathematical Intelligence
   d. Interpersonal Intelligence

4. Consider the effects on students of being labeled "intellectually slow" or "academically weak", compared to students with similar characteristics who are not labeled. Which of the following is the most accurate statement according to research?
   a. Because they're identified, teachers provide more attention and support for labeled students
   b. Teachers provide less attention and support for labeled students than for comparable peers
   c. Teachers provide about the same structure and support

OVER

5. Social learning theory is best described as a view of learning that:
   a. emphasizes the social interactions that occur among students in classrooms.
   b. emphasizes the ways that students perceive and think about problems.
   c. emphasizes the effects of observing others on students' thoughts and behaviors.
   d. emphasizes the strategies that students use to solve interpersonal problems.

6. Which of the following teacher statements most promotes a learning-focused rather than performance-focused classroom?
   a. "Let's try hard now. I want to see a lot of A's and B's on the next test."
   b. "Very well done. Every person in the class improved on their scores compared to the last quiz."
   c. "Very good, everyone. Over half the class got either an A or a B on the last test."
   d. "C'mon now. Let's give some of these top students a run for their money on this assignment."

7. Which of the following systems of discipline advocate that rules be prominently displayed in the classroom and that teachers employ a simple system for setting consequences?
   a. Assertive Discipline
   b. Glasser's ten step program
   c. Jones "Discipline with Dignity" approach
   d. The Dreikur's Democratic Discipline format

8. Test content and/or procedures that favor one culture over another is defined as:
   a. diagnostic testing
   b. biased testing
   c. aptitude testing
   d. minimum competency testing

Content Evaluation Questions:
How do you think learning occurs? (Answer in 1-2 sentences)

Please list any examples of things done in this course that addressed how you as a teacher can diversify instruction to meet individual differences? (i.e., multiple intelligences, learning styles, cultural diversity)

How do you think teachers can best stimulate students' higher order or critical thinking skills?

What are strategies teachers can use to help students become self-motivated?

Alternative Assessment
For each of the assessment possibilities listed below, place a check mark (√) by those you discussed in your ed. psyc. class. In addition, put a star (*) by those you think you might use in your classroom

___Written exams/Quizzes
___Portfolios
___Projects
___Research Papers
___Thought Papers
___Reflective Journals
___Classroom Participation
___Presentations
___Verbal Questioning
___Student Developed Tests
___Debates
___Think Alouds
___Learning Logs
___Exhibits
___Case Studies
___Performances

Sequencing Instruction Exercise
Listed below are 9 steps for a lesson in dichotomous classification for grades 5-8. The "potato chip classification" lesson steps are not in the correct order. Please number them as you think the lesson should proceed.

___Ask each group to devise and test a different dichotmous key
___Record results of first division & make a dichotomous key
___Display bags of chips and discuss similarities and differences
___Repeat the activity with another object such as candy or shoes
___Divide class into groups of 4-6 students
___Record and share the groups keys with the rest of the class
___Ask a volunteer to divide chips into 2 groups based on a similarity
___Provide each group with a sample set of chips
___Eat the chips!

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. When did you take this class? (summer, fall or spring)
2. How many times a week did your class meet?
3. Age-
   Ethnicity-
   Gender-
   Graduate/undergraduate-
   Program of Studies?
4. Why did you take the class?
5. What knowledge did you have about educational psychology prior to the class?
6. How did the professor assess your prior knowledge?
7. What were the three most important things that you learned in the course?
8. What type of instructional practices/methods did the professor use?
9. How did your professor cover teaching as research?
10. Did a cognitive science view of learning play a large part in your class?
    -E/N
    -COL
11. Did a behavioral classroom management view play a large part in your class?
12. Did your instructor make an effort to meet the instructional needs of students from under-represented groups?
13. Did your professor address contemporary cognitive, social, and cultural constructivists views of learning theory and teaching?
14. Did your professor cover humanism?
15. Would you describe yourself as a postmodernist?
16. Would you describe yourself as a feminist?
17. What topics were you interested in the most? What topics appeared to be of special interest to the class?
18. To what extent did the instructors use innovative teaching methods?
19. What amount of time was allotted field-based activities in your class? Do you consider field-based activities to be important?
20. What one thing would you have changed in the course if you could?
21. What is the one thing you enjoyed most about the course?
22. What would you wish to see covered more thoroughly in the class?
23. Did the focus of the class meet your needs? If not, what topics and/or activities would have made the course better?
24. When do you think that this class should be taught within the context of the teacher certification programs of study?
25. Do you have any questions to put to me?
26. Describe how you learn.
27. What do you consider to be your strengths and weaknesses?
28. What were your instructor's strengths and weaknesses?
29. Were you satisfied with your grade in this course?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PROFESSORS

1. When was your class taught? (summer, fall or spring)
2. How many times a week did your class meet?
3. Age-
   Ethnicity-
   Gender-
4. What types of students did you have in your class? (teachers, school psychology majors, others)
5. Were you challenged as a teacher in the course?
6. Did you make an effort to assess student's prior knowledge and establish a baseline of knowledge?
7. How did you do this?
8. Describe your overall conceptual framework? What do you consider to be the three most important things students should learn in the educational psychology class?
9. What type of instructional methods did you use?
10. What are your views related to viewing teaching as research?
11. Did a cognitive science view of learning play a large part in your class?
    -E/N
    -COL
12. Did a behavioral classroom management view play a large part in your class?
13. How did you design your course to meet the instructional needs of students from under-represented groups?
14. Describe your views of cognitive, social, and cultural constructivism.
15. Describe your view of humanism.
16. Would you describe yourself as a postmodernist?
17. Would you describe yourself as a feminist?
18. What topics did the students like most?
19. Overall, what would you say is your main instructional method?
20. What amount of time was allotted for field-based activities in your class? Do you consider field-based activities to be important?
21. What is the one thing that you liked most about the course?
22. What is the one thing that you would change in the course if you could?
23. What did you wish you emphasized more?
24. What was your overall goal in teaching educational psychology? (Why did you teach the class?).
25. What were your students' strengths and weaknesses?
26. What do you perceive to be your strengths and weaknesses?
27. When do you think this class should be taught within the context of the teacher certification programs of study?
28. Do you have any questions to put to me?

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034859

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Variability in Teaching Educational Psychology: Comparisons Across Variables

Author(s): Johnson, E.J. + Morgan. R.R.

Corporate Source: AERA
Governor State University

Publication Date: 4-24-03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: E.J. Johnson	Printed Name/Position/Title: E. Jean Johnson
Organization/Address: GovSt. Univ. University Pk, IL 60466	Telephone: j-johnson@govst.edu FAX:
E-Mail Address: 708-235-2149	Date: 4/22/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: **University of Maryland**
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions